IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

)
In re FEDERATED MUTUAL FUNDS) Consolidated No. 2:04-cv-352-DSC
EXCESSIVE FEE LITIGATION)
) Electronically Filed

JOINT STIPULATION AND RULE 41(a)(1)(ii) VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL

Plaintiffs Gretchen W. Reaves, Nina Monahan, Mary Ann Abendroth, and Lawrence Zucker (collectively "Plaintiffs"), and Defendants Federated Investors, Inc., Federated Equity Management Company of Pennsylvania, Federated Investment Management Company, and Federated Global Investment Management Corporation (collectively, "Federated Defendants"), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby give joint notice of the voluntary dismissal of this case with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(ii):

- 1. In 2003, the New York Attorney General (the "NYAG") and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") and other state authorities began investigating numerous mutual fund companies, including Federated, regarding certain practices within the mutual fund industry. The NYAG, through its public statements, indicated that it believed these practices existed because of the mutual fund industry's desire to generate increased fees, while allegedly diluting the return to certain investors.
- 2. Thereafter, a series of lawsuits was filed alleging that Federated Defendants charged excessive fees to certain mutual funds, including Federated Kaufmann Fund (the "Fund"). These cases included: (1) *Burres, et al., v. Federated Equity Management Company of Pennsylvania, M.D. Fla.*, filed in February 2004; (2) *In re Federated Mutual Fund Excessive Fee Litigation, W.D. Pa.*, filed in March 2004; (3) *Bauer v. Federated Equity Management Company*

of Pennsylvania, W.D. Pa., filed in May 2004; (4) Fetzer v. Federated Investors, Inc., et al., W.D. Pa., filed in May 2004; (5) Gretchen Reaves v. Federated Investors, Inc., et al., W.D. Pa., filed in June 2004; and (6) Lawrence Zucker v. Federated Shareholder Services Co., et al., filed in September 2005.

- 3. The original lawsuits asserted several causes of action under a variety of state and federal laws with respect to numerous fees charged to mutual funds managed by Federated.
- 4. In 2008, Plaintiffs consolidated their separate cases into one Consolidated Amended Complaint ("CAC") as captioned above ("the Litigation").
- 5. The Litigation asserted a claim only on behalf of the Fund, alleging that the investment advisory fee charged by Federated Defendants to manage the Fund violated Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940. This action challenged the investment advisory fees paid by the Fund from June 25, 2003 through the date of trial (the "alleged Damages Period").
- 6. While certain facts were not contested, Federated Defendants denied all allegations of wrongdoing, and have consistently asserted that they have acted at all times in a manner consistent with their fiduciary obligations under Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940.
- 7. On November 17, 2005, Federated settled the NYAG's investigation pursuant to an Assurance of Discontinuance ("AOD"), whereby Federated agreed to reduce the management fees charged to certain mutual funds distributed to retail investors in the United States and to implement certain processes.
- 8. Plaintiffs actively prosecuted the Litigation over the last seven years. Plaintiffs have sought and obtained substantial discovery from Federated Defendants, including the

produced, and have deposed senior representatives of the Federated Defendants and independent trustees on the Fund's Board of Trustees. Plaintiffs also retained expert witnesses, and received reports from and deposed Federated Defendants' retained expert witnesses. Federated Defendants received reports from and deposed Plaintiffs' expert witnesses. The parties engaged in substantial motions practice throughout the Litigation. They also filed lengthy pre-trial briefs, proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and pre-trial statements.

- 9. Federated Defendants assert that a substantial portion of the documents and information that they furnished to the Plaintiffs is highly confidential and proprietary business information that discloses, among other things, the unique and internal costs, expenses, and profits of Federated and confidential documents relating to the defense and settlement of the NYAG investigation. Upon the filing of this Joint Stipulation and Rule 41(a)(1)(ii) Voluntary Dismissal, all documents previously designated by Federated Defendants to be confidential (and any and all copies thereof), will be destroyed or returned to Federated in accordance with the Stipulated Protective Order signed by the Court on March 23, 2007.
- begun on April 12, 2011. Plaintiffs and Federated Defendants have filed exhibit lists, designations and cross-designations of deposition testimony, and related objections. They have also filed a list of the witnesses they intend to offer in support of their case-in-chief. Plaintiffs were prepared to elicit testimony from the individual plaintiffs, as well as numerous current and former directors, officers and employees of Federated Defendants, the former Bureau Chief of the NYAG's Investment Protection Bureau during the time of the NYAG investigation, and Plaintiffs' retained experts. Federated Defendants were prepared to elicit testimony from

numerous current and former directors, officers and employees, numerous independent trustees and their independent counsel, and Federated Defendants' retained experts.

- 11. Plaintiffs were prepared to introduce into evidence at trial documents, exhibits, and testimony which they believe would establish that, notwithstanding the AOD, Federated Defendants have continued to violate their fiduciary duties under Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 by charging an excessive investment advisory fee to the Fund during the alleged Damages Period.
- 12. Federated Defendants were prepared to introduce into evidence at trial documents, exhibits, and testimony which they believe would establish that Federated Defendants complied with their fiduciary duties under Section 36(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, and therefore did not charge an excessive investment advisory fee to the Fund.
- 13. After a complete review of the evidence, and with substantial assistance of the Court, the parties have concluded that there is substantial cost and substantial risk if the case were to proceed to trial and, accordingly, the parties have decided to end the Litigation pursuant to a Confidential Memorandum of Understanding.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND THE PARTIES HEREBY

REQUEST that the Court approve the forgoing joint stipulation of material facts and order the dismissal of this Action with prejudice.

Dated: April 29, 2011

By: /s/ Joseph E. Culleiton Joseph E. Culleiton, One of Counsel for Federated Defendants

REED SMITH LLP

Thomas L. Allen, PA 33243 Perry A. Napolitano, PA 56789 Joseph E. Culleiton, PA 82823 James L. Rockney, Jr., PA 200026 225 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1200 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222 (412) 288-3131

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY LLP James N. Benedict, Pro Hac Vice Sean M. Murphy, Pro Hac Vice James G. Cavoli, Pro Hac Vice C. Neil Gray, Pro Hac Vice One Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, New York 10005

(212) 530-5000

Counsel for Federated Defendants

By: /s/ Guy M. Burns Guy M. Burns, One of Counsel for Plaintiffs

Jeffrey C. Block, Esquire jblock@bermanesq.com Leslie R. Stern, Esquire lstern@bermanesq.com Berman, DeValerio, Pease, Tabacco, Burt & Pucillo One Liberty Square 8th Floor Boston, MA 02109 Attorneys for Plaintiff Lawrence Zucker

Alfred G. Yates, Jr., Esquire YatesLaw@aol.com Gerald L. Rutledge, Esquire YatesLaw@aol.com Law Office of Alfred Yates, Jr., P.C. 519 Allegheny Building 429 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Attorneys for Plaintiffs John M. Spahn, IRA, Susan Ciccone, Sam Taylor Solomon, Jr., Mary Cole, Mary Ann Abendroth, Sanford Max and Suzanne Fetzer

Janine L. Pollack, Esquire
jpollack@milberg.com
Jerry Congress, Esquire
jcongress@milberg.com
Anna C. Dover, Esquire
adover@milberg.com
Milberg LLP
One Pennsylvania Plaza, 48th Floor
New York, NY 10119-0165
Attorneys for Plaintiffs John M. Spahn, IRA,
Susan Ciccone, Sam Taylor Solomon, Jr.,
Mary Cole, Mary Ann Abendroth, Sanford
Max and Suzanne Fetzer

Charles J. Piven, Esquire
piven@browerpiven.com
Brower Piven, P.C.
1925 Old Valley Road
Stevenson, MD 21153
Attorneys for Plaintiffs John M. Spahn, IRA,
Susan Ciccone, Sam Taylor Solomon, Jr., Mary
Cole, Mary Ann Abendroth, Sanford Max and
Suzanne Fetzer

Guy M. Burns, Esquire guyb@jpfirm.com Jonathan S. Coleman, Esquire jonathanc@jpfirm.com Johnson, Pope, Bokor Ruppel & Burns, L.L.P. 403 East Madison Street, Suite 400 Tampa, FL 33602 Attorneys for Plaintiff Nina Monahan

Tampa, FL 33602 Attorneys for Plaintiff Nina Monahan Lynn Lincoln Sarko, Esquire lsarko@kellerrohrback.com Michael D. Woerner, Esquire mwoerner@kellerrohrback.com Gretchen F. Cappio, Esquire gcappio@kellerrohrback.com Tana Lin, Esquire tlin@kellerrohrback.com Laura Gerber, Esquire lgerber@kellerrohrback.com Keller Rohrback, LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, WA 98101-3052 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Gary M. Bauer, Walter

Neit, Leonard Burres, Jules Cooper, James

Monahan and Nina Monahan

Ellen M. Doyle, Esquire edoyle@stemberfeinstein.com
Stember, Feinstein, Doyle & Payne, LLC
17th Floor Allegheny Building
429 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Attorney for Plaintiffs Gary M. Bauer, Walter
Neit, Leonard Burres, Jules Cooper, James
Monahan and Nina Monahan

Michael Brickman, Esquire
mbrickman@rpwb.com
James C. Bradley, Esquire
jbradley@rpwb.com
Nina H. Fields, Esquire
nfields@rpwb.com
Richardson, Patrick, Westbrook
& Brickman LLC
174 E. Bay Street
Charleston, SC 29401
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Gary M. Bauer, Walter
Neit, Leonard Burres, Jules Cooper, James
Monahan and Nina Monahan

Jerome A. Broadhurst, Esquire jbroadhurst@appersoncrump.com Charles Durham Reaves, Esquire creaves44@comcast.net Apperson Crump PLC 6070 Poplar Avenue Sixth Floor Memphis, TN 38119-3954 Attorney for Plaintiff Gretchen W. Reaves

Vincent Coppola, Esquire vcoppola@pribanic.com Pribanic & Pribanic 513 Court Place Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Attorney for Plaintiff Lawrence Zucker Eduard Korsinsky, Esquire
ek@zlk.com
Zimmerman Levi & Korsinsky, LLP
39 Broadway, Suite 1601
New York, NY 10006
Attorney for Plaintiff Lawrence Zucker